1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	SKANSKA USA BUILDING, INC., a)
12	Delaware corporation,) CIV. S-05-537 GEB GGH
13	Plaintiff,)
14	v.) ORDER RE OBJECTIONS TO
15	ROGERS-QUINN CONSTRUCTION, INC.,) STATUS (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING) a California corporation,) ORDER
16	Defendant.)
17	ROGERS-QUINN CONSTRUCTION, INC., a)
18	California corporation,)
19	Counter-Claimant,)
20	V.)
21	SKANSKA USA BUILDING, INC., a) Delaware corporation,)
22) Counter-Defendant.)
23)
24	Plaintiff's "Objection and Request for Clarification to
25	Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Order" ("Objection") is erroneously
26	premised on the notion that the parties unambiguously agreed that
27	Plaintiff could file an amendment to its Complaint. But the parties'
28	Joint Status Report ("JSR") is vague on this point. Specifically,

Rogers-Quinn Construction, Inc. ("R.Q."), "agreed to stipulate to the amendment of the complaint provided that the amendments conform to prior communications Skanska has had with R.Q. concerning proposed amendments to the complaint." (JSR at 2.) Therefore, Plaintiff's objection is overruled. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: June 28, 2005 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr. GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR. United States District Judge